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1.0 INTRODUCTION

This document forms the Report of the Independent Assessor (Environmental Impact) on the issues raised by comments on the Environmental Statement (ES) published by the Department of Transport relating to the High-Speed Rail (London - West Midlands) Bill, commonly known as the HS2 Bill. The public consultation ran from 25 November 2013 to 27 February 2014. The ES and supporting materials were produced by HS2 Ltd and the Department for Transport, published by the Department for Transport. The Secretary of State for Transport set the consultation period, under the terms of the House of Commons Standing Orders. The ES was made available to the public online on 25 November 2013 and also made available in hard copy from online, library and direct sources on request.

In 2013 the two Houses of Parliament passed new Standing Orders to appoint an Independent Assessor to prepare a summary of issues raised in comments on the consultation and to be submitted to Parliament in advance of the Second Reading of the HS2 Bill. The Standing Orders use the term ‘comment’; in this report the terms ‘response’ and ‘submission’ are also used. The Standing Order required a group of impartial Parliamentary officials, the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, to appoint the Independent Assessor. The Examiners, after undertaking an advertised public procurement procedure, appointed Golder Associates (UK) Ltd as the Independent Assessor on 5 December 2013. The Examiners were required under the Standing Orders to set a deadline for the Assessor to compile the summary report and submit it to the Examiners. This period had to be a minimum of 28 days from the date all comments were sent to the Assessor following the end of the consultation period. The Examiners set a period of 31 days, meaning that the report had to be submitted by 7 April 2014.

This Report sets out the results of the work of the Independent Assessor in respect of the HS2 ES. The Report is intended to enable the reader to understand the patterns and key issues arising from the public consultation, along with the presentation of a synthesis of the consultation responses. The public consultation produced 21,833 comments during the consultation period.

Results are presented in terms of key issues raised for the Project as a whole and by Community Forum Area (CFA) for the length of the proposed line (the 26 CFAs are discrete geographical areas defined in the ES.) The Assessor was required by Parliament only to “summarise” the issues raised by comments on the Environmental Statement” (see House of Commons Standing Order 224A(6)(i)). Therefore the Independent Assessor, in this Report, does not provide a judgement on the validity or otherwise of comments received against the technical design work, documentation, development process and proposed mitigation measures for the proposed High Speed Line, particularly in regard to individual submissions and geographic features. However, the Report does comment on issues of significance as expressed in the responses, and highlights areas where the public has expressed particular concern.

The Report has been organised into two principal sections:

i) An Introductory section setting out the Terms of Reference, work programme, approach, and methodology applied by the Independent Assessor;

ii) Results, presented as
   1) Key Issues; and
   2) CFA results.
The Report was submitted to the Examiners on 7 April 2014, in line with the Standing Order requirement, for submission by the Examiners to Parliament. We believe the report faithfully and objectively represents the views and issues as received by the Independent Assessor. In line with the requirements of the House of Commons Standing Orders, the Department of Transport will publish all responses received. The responses will be made available online during April 2014 via the ES Consultation page on the gov.uk website. The Independent Assessor has no role in the publication of responses.

1.1 The Assessment Parameters

This section of the Report sets out the intent of the assessment process as well as the methods used to achieve the results. This will clarify the approach used by the Assessor and enable the reader to understand the results in the appropriate context. Throughout, the approach has been to maintain complete independence and to construct a process in which all responses are given due consideration.

Terms of Reference

This Report is focussed on the outcomes of the public consultation in response to the ES relating to the High-Speed Rail (London - West Midlands) Bill. The Bill proposes a high speed railway line running from London to Birmingham including a connection to the West Coast Main Line near Lichfield, proposed infrastructure in West London and a connection to HS1 in North London. After the consultation closed, the Secretary of State for Transport announced that the Government planned to remove the HS1 link from the Bill. This report, however, references all comments made on the proposed HS1 link. The Assessor was not required to provide judgement on the quality of the ES itself, such as the value of any community relations along the proposed route, the structure and delivery of the EIA process, or the appropriateness of proposed designs, mitigation and route location decisions, although the report summarises comments made by respondents on all these issues.

The aim has been to provide Parliament and the wider public with a summary of key issues and concerns expressed as outcomes from the above process in a timely fashion following closure of the consultation process. The Assessor has been instructed to perform the role in an independent fashion and has therefore kept a proper distance from all interested parties, except where this was required for administrative reasons, principally as part of the process of receiving responses from the Department of Transport’s contractor (described below) and to request any materials that were needed to support the Assessor’s work programme.

The Independent Assessor

The Examiners required the Independent Assessor to demonstrate that its staff had the knowledge and skills to assess the subject matter of the responses and produce a summary to assist both Houses of Parliament in their consideration of the hybrid bill. The Examiners also required that the firm itself and the staff working on this project had no vested interest in the HS2 project and that neither the firm nor the individuals in question could reasonably be assumed to be biased in relation to the HS2 project. Golder Associates is a UK based company with a UK based team of environmental consultants demonstrating a long track record of working on environmental assessments throughout the UK. The firm is one of the leading providers of Environmental Assessments worldwide and has its own teams of environmental specialists from ecologists to air, noise and water specialists and planning and policy experts covering the complete range of disciplines required for environmental assessment. Golder Associates has no current commercial interest in any particular outcome from the decision-making process relating to the HS2 project.
The firm is also an international leader in environmental IT, both to support environmental assessment and for specialised applications for complex analysis of environmental issues. The firm applied its own environmental consultation management software application – GoldStake – for the management and logging of responses.

**Timeline of Assessment**

As noted above, the ES was published on 25 November and the Secretary of State for Transport set a deadline for the receipt of comments of 56 days, i.e. by 24 January 2014. However, following publication, it was discovered that some elements of the ES documentation were missing. This error was corrected by 18 December 2013. The relevant Parliamentary authorities concluded that as the whole text of the ES documentation had not been fully available on 25 November 2013, the consultation period should be extended. A new deadline of 27 February was therefore set.

The Independent Assessor commenced processing received responses as they arrived, although the majority, as is normally the case in consultation exercises, arrived close to the final submission deadline.

Throughout, the Independent Assessor has been conscious of the need to devote adequate time and resources to the analysis of all comments received, as well as the very real interest demonstrated by the public and interested organisations in accessing the summary of the consultation. To balance these requirements, the Assessor applied varying levels of staff resources to match the flow of responses. The timetable for preparing the final Report was set by the Examiners following discussion with the Independent Assessor, and in setting the timetable the Examiner took account of the final volume of responses, the size and complexity of responses, and the time that would be required to ensure each response received full consideration and analysis.

**Process**

Public responses to the ES were submitted directly to the Department for Transport, under the requirements of the Standing Order, with no involvement from the Independent Assessor. The consultation and the process for submitting comments were designed by HS2 Ltd, working with the Department of Transport. Every response was passed on directly from electronic or physical post boxes to the Department’s selected processing contractor without any third party opening or reviewing any response.

The Department’s contractor was responsible for logging, opening and (in the case of hard copy responses) electronically scanning all received responses, as the responsible party of receipt. The comments were electronically transferred to the Independent Assessor in batches, with each response having its own individual reference number.

On receipt of a batch, the Independent Assessor allocated each response with another reference number appropriate for the software programme and referring to the response position within the processing system for stand-alone referencing. Each such reference number is directly linked to the logging reference number to provide an audit trail to the point of receipt.

The Independent Assessor developed a bespoke approach for the handling of the responses based on the proprietary GoldStake response management system and created a series of management screens and dashboards to reflect the expected key issues, types of responses as well as detailed management and monitoring of team performance and outcomes.
Members of the Independent Assessor team were allocated individual batches of responses for processing by its Project Manager, who then allocated further batches on completion of assignments to maintain schedules. The Independent Assessor took the view not to use either external sub-contractors to assist in the process or to apply key word based algorithms for data input. This was undertaken to maximise accuracy at point of input using team members who are environmental professionals and therefore familiar with the issues, requirements and subtleties of environmental assessment. All the inputting team received specific project focussed training on both the project issues and the bespoke programme requirements. Any issue that could not be allocated by an inputter, or was less than clear in its import, was allocated to an Assistance Required log which was analysed daily by senior technical team members.

The database management structure also included reference and logic checks to avoid record duplications and mis-keying of records. The Independent Assessor also had access to senior specialist experts in all technical areas of environmental assessment throughout the course of the assessment to provide an additional level of expert input as necessary.

**GoldStake System**

In order to register, sort, manage and assess the responses, the Independent Assessor used its own proprietary consultation response management software GoldStake. This system also includes a useful project management capability allowing the users to monitor progress, set parameters to minimise human errors and access all responses with appropriate audit trails.

Large scale projects which generate extensive public interest require robust, dynamic and effective systems to collate, sort, define and respond to public interaction. From the Independent Assessor’s experience of the environmental assessment of large scale developments, the Assessor recognised that a robust integrated system would be required. Following an evaluation of database and system providers, Golder established a partnership with software development house Isometrix and has worked to develop GoldStake – a stakeholder management tool to assist its stakeholder engagement programmes. The application's general features are:

- It is a central web-based database - allowing access for controlled viewing or editing capabilities assigned by the database administrator;
- Linked to spatial software (GIS);
- Has customisable interactive dashboards which allow users to drill into data through interactive charts and maps;
- Has customisable reporting systems which can export the data to Word, Excel, Pdf; and
- Is customisable to client and country (legal) requirements for stakeholder management and the use of personal information.

**1.2 Responses**

**Volume of Responses**

The total volume of responses received by Monday 3 March 2014 was 21,833. This was made up of a variety of types of responses (see below). The consultation response cut-off time was set as midnight on Thursday 27 February 2014 with postal submissions being accepted into the following week, provided the posting time could be demonstrated as being prior to the deadline. Electronic submissions were closed at midnight on 27 February.
With a considerable number of responses arriving from electronic addresses or in the form of campaign postcards, the Independent Assessor did not relate each response in terms of its geographical provenance, which in many cases could not be determined. Instead, the focus was to relate each response to the relevant CFA (or multiple CFAs as required) or to other appropriate categories. The consultation was open to national responses and was not restricted to the public in the immediate project hinterland or CFA.

The revised submission deadline probably did not, in the opinion of the Independent Assessor, negatively affect the total volume of submissions. In addition, in between the original deadline and revised deadline new examples of issue campaigns were received by the Independent Assessor, suggesting that the opportunity was taken to submit additional responses.

Responses which referred to other responses (e.g. local authority submissions) were categorised where possible according to the contents of the referenced submission (or specific referenced issue) as requested by the correspondent, but were only logged according to their own typology.

**Types of Responses by Volume**

Figure 1-1 presents the typology of responses for the complete consultation responses.

![Figure 1-1: Responses Resulting from the Public Consultation of the Environmental Statement for Phase 1 of HS2](image)

It can be seen that the most common type of response received was the campaign postcard. Letter submissions (either postal or electronic) were categorised into different categories depending on size of submission. The Consultation organisers had also made available an electronic form for the public to submit its comments and concerns.

The Independent Assessor did not have access to any submissions made to the Department of Transport during public consultation presentations and events, unless the respondent followed up with a submission made directly to the consultation process as described above.
The responses included a number of documents presenting formal submissions from a range of organisations including public authorities, special interest groups and others of a national and local level. Whilst forming a smaller number in terms of submissions, the content and extent of the response could be considerable ranging up to 800 pages for some individual submissions. Whilst counting as an individual submission in the response statistics, all issues covered in each submission were assessed and considered and so, where appropriate, they contribute to the overall results and commentary that follows in more depth.

These documents will, like individual responses, be published by the Department for Transport and made available for further analysis and discussion as appropriate.

**Issues Analysis**

It is not the place of this Report to comment on every single individual instance and expression of concern along the whole route. These can be accessed once all the responses are published. Where issues were referenced by a number of separate correspondents to a level which was noticeable in the analysis, these are highlighted in Section 2.0 of this Report as appropriate.

**Calibration with Environmental Statement Categories**

The Independent Assessor has used the categorisation of issues as defined by the ES where possible as the foundation of its analysis. This enables the presentation and discussion of the results in Section Two of this Report to be easily related to the material and locations presented in the ES material. These have been supplemented by additional categories considered by the Independent Assessor as worthwhile to include, as well as a smaller number of issues that arose from multiple submissions in the response results. There were no issues arising in the submission material received which could not be allocated to the appropriate area for logging or discussion.

The Assessor has also used the designation of the CFAs as the foundation of the results presentation in Section 2.0. These will enable interested parties to quickly gain an understanding of and relate local issues (where expressed in this manner) to the relevant section of the proposed route. These are illustrated in Figure 1-2 below.
Figure 1-2: CFA designations for the Phase 1 Proposed Route

Not all submissions fell neatly into the CFA designation. Many responses commented solely on concerns with the route and/or proposals as a whole and did not allocate themselves to a particular area. Others were concerned with impacts on a more regional level which often did not specify CFA area, although the local geographical implications were clear. For submissions which fell into these categories the Independent Assessor presents results in a number of selected geographical denominations which in practice reflect ‘hot spots’ of public concern. These categories supplement CFA submission results and are not duplicated across categories.

Categories of Issues

The Independent Assessor used the following list of principal categories to establish key issues that were of public concern. These categories included all those established in the ES along with additional categories created by the Assessor. Where responses covered a number of concerns and issues, these concerns and issues were logged as separate instances. In the following listing the issue headings are followed by examples of elements and concerns that are included under that heading.

ES environmental topics are as follows:

- **Agriculture, Forestry and Soils**: farming and other rural enterprises, farm buildings, related land use and woodland planting, ancient woodlands;

- **Air Quality**: dust and emissions/pollutants related to construction and operational traffic, including as a result of road traffic increase around stations and depots;
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Community: general effects on residential property, community facilities and communities as a whole: e.g. effects on public footpaths, bridleways, parks and gardens. Temporary presence of construction workers;

Cultural Heritage: ancient burials, old buildings, designated assets (e.g., Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas) buried archaeology, historic landscapes. The 'setting' (local landscape situation) of these heritage assets is covered here. Palaeoenvironmental resources (ancient environments) are also considered;

Ecology: protected species, biodiversity, wildlife, habitat disturbance, loss and restoration. Nb. 'ecological value' is covered here but the community and social/economic value of ecological resources is considered within other categories;

Electromagnetic Interference: disturbance of the electrical system, induction, radiation etc;

Land Quality: contaminated land and newly occurring ground contamination. Groundwater concerns where related to contamination. Leaks/spillages etc. geological issues are also in this category, as are mineral resources;

Landscape and Visual Assessment: change to landscape character and views. Concern re: visible components related to the development – e.g. overhead lines;

Socio-economics: trade, employment, business and the economy/markets (local and national). E.g. isolation effects on businesses or opportunities for jobs during construction/operation. Labour supply. Changes in demographics also included here;

Sound, noise and vibration: as an issue for people and where they live, and as related to shared community open areas, schools, hospitals, etc. or the route in general;

Traffic and Transport: covers all modes of transport, to include walking and cycling, road and rail, waterways and air. Includes diversions and change in the volume of traffic/congestion/emptiness. Also includes accident/health and safety risks;

Waste and Material Resources: off-site disposal to landfill of solid waste from construction and demolition activities (and related earthworks design). Includes waste generated (not material inputs e.g. aggregates required for construction). Disposal of contaminated soil; and

Water Resources and Flood Risk Assessment: Surface water features, both natural and artificial and ground water concerns (where not related to contamination – a land quality issue). Flood risk and drainage networks (and sewers). Disposal of liquid waste.

In addition to the above further categories were included to cover comments that did not fall into any of the above categories. These are:

Greenbelt development: concerns that planning applications may now be approved where they may have been refused previously;

Sustainability: strategic environmental impacts including carbon issues, economics, energy requirements, long term environmental consumables, climate change, behavioural change;

Tunnel: this was used for comments expressing the desire for a particular section to be fully tunnelled, for example The Chilterns;

Not specified: used when no comments have been made at all;

Property value: used when the comment specifically relate to property value;

Compensation: used when the comment specifically relate to compensation;
SUMMARY REPORT

- **Expense**: general issues relating to the project cost;

- **Public Consultation issues/time**: used for issues related to the public consultation process in general, e.g. too many pages, not enough time to respond, methods, difficulty with electronic forms;

- **Government**: used for general issues purely with regards to the Government e.g. ‘I will not vote for this government again’;

- **Environment**: for comments regarding the environment that are general statements that do not specify any of the other categories e.g. ‘the project will damage the environment’. If more specific issues are mentioned then the appropriate issue category was used e.g. if it says ‘the project will damage the environment and all the wildlife’ then the response was categorised under ‘Ecology’;

- **Infrastructure**: This is for comments that relate to suggestions to upgrade/improve the existing infrastructure (railway lines) rather than build a new one;

- **Mental Health/Anxiety Concerns**: This is for perceived mental health issues, for example if somebody writes “the stress will kill me”. Only used for perceived health issues that do not fit any other category. Any specific health issue related to a specific environmental impact is categorised in the appropriate issue, for example ‘Air Quality’;

- **Other**: used for ‘other’ issues such as requests for information (RFI). All use of this category included a comment preceded by the word ‘other’, for example “Other: RFI”. The ‘other’ comments were closely monitored and if any trends were observed then an additional category issue was added: and

- **Lower The Line**: this was used where responses were concerned that sections of the proposed line should be lowered in height. This category was added due to the volume of responses regarding this issue.

- **Positive for the Line**: used when positive comments were made.

1.3 **Campaigns**

The Consultation on the ES saw the receipt of a number of specific campaigns, with correspondents using pre-produced material for submission. These varied from campaign postcards to standard letter text. On many of these, correspondents had been encouraged by the organisers to add their own comments. Where these highlighted an additional concern or issue to that of the campaign material, the additional issue(s) was logged. This means that all campaign material, even where using standard submissions, was checked by the Independent Assessor for variants. It was not simply assumed that campaign cards were uniform and could be logged automatically. Some campaigns overlapped and were concerned with the same issue or geographic area.
The Independent Assessor received responses from a number of distinct campaigns as follows:

1) Postcard titled “Don’t miss your chance to tell David Cameron the only AONB on the route of HS2 needs a full tunnel”. This Campaign is requesting ‘the longest possible tunnel throughout the entire AONB’ of the Chilterns.

2) Postcard is titled “Stop HS2 Hillingdon” and argues against the rejection by the Secretary of State for Transport and HS2 Ltd of an extended railway tunnel for the Ickenham and Harefield areas of west London.

3) Postcard is titled “Save Camden Town from HS2!” and is campaigning for the proposed HS1/HS2 Link line to be tunnelled.

4) Postcard produced by HS2 Action Alliance and Stop HS2. The main message of the postcard is to campaign to lower the line beneath the West Coast Main Line and A38 near Lichfield. There is also space on this postcard for individual further comments to be made.

5) This campaign is a one page letter that expresses various concerns related to the Lichfield area.

6) This campaign is an almost exact replica of the campaign above but does not refer to Lichfield, and is worded slightly differently in places.

7) Two page letter relating to Camden and the HS1 Link and is predominantly focused on tunnelling being the preferred option. Letter relates to Camden Town Unlimited.

8) This is a two page campaign letter titled “Resident’s Comments on the HS2 Environmental Statement” relating to Camden Town and HS1 Link. There is also space for respondents to add their own comments.

9) Single sided postcard campaigning for a short, cut and cover tunnel for Hints Village and surrounding areas.

10) This is a 1 page letter campaigning for a tunnel through Camden.

11) This is a 3 page letter comprising an individual cover letter with an attached two page campaign on behalf of the residents of Old Waste Lane and Waste Lane in the parish of Berkswell.

12) Postcard detailing a list of statements relating to Euston and the link across Camden to HS1. Each statement has a tick box, therefore each postcard can be categorised slightly differently depending on which statements have been ticked.

13) This is a one page letter containing various environmental concerns campaigning predominantly for a short, cut and cover tunnel for Hints Village and surrounding areas.

14) This is a two page letter comprising an extensive list of statements with tick boxes relating to the Camden and Euston area. Each postcard can be categorised slightly differently depending on which statements have been ticked.

15) This is a one page letter relating to concerns for Lichfield, it is predominantly campaigning to lower the line.

16) This is a one page letter relating to issues associated with construction around the Camden Area.

17) This is a one page email letter addressed to Secretary of State, which is a general campaign against the project.
18) This is a three page letter detailing numerous concerns around the Wells House Road Cul-de-sac area.

19) This is a campaign based on the standard ES Response form relating to CFA13 and 14, containing numerous concerns.

20) Postcard detailing various environmental concerns related to Ladbroke and Southam.

21) This is a one page letter detailing numerous issues related to CFA3.

22) This is a two page letter relating to Euston with space for additional comments.

23) This is an eight page email campaign with numerous concerns raised across unspecified areas.

The campaign responses formed the larger part of all received responses by volume. Some examples are located in Annex A.

1.4 Organisation Responses

The Independent Assessor received a number of responses from organisations and groups with an interest in the outcomes of the HS2 Phase 1 project. Many submissions evidenced close analysis of the ES, often supported by professional and legal opinion.

This Report is not intended to be a discussion of the detailed content of these submissions and the arguments contained within them, although the issues raised by these documents have been included in the results analysis.

Information regarding names of organisations that submitted responses to the ES can be found with published consultation responses on the consultation website.
2.0 RESULTS

2.1 Key Issues

This section of the Report presents a summary of the key issues and concerns received from all respondents to the ES public consultation. The results reflect the volume of responses from a wide range of respondents, ranging from individuals to public authorities, commercial organisations (business and agriculture), Interest Groups and Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) concerned with natural and cultural heritage, community issues and campaigns.

This section is designed to provide the reader with a quick and accurate picture of the feedback received from the entire public consultation, the key issues by volume and ranking of issues to show respective importance as provided by the responses. *It does not evaluate responses on a technical level against assumptions presented in the ES.* This is in line with the role of the Independent Assessor only to summarise comments, rather than give an evaluation of them. Responses referencing individual CFAs are detailed in Section 2.2.

This section also provides the reader with a snapshot of the issues expressed within each category to give a better understanding of key concerns than can be given simply by headline statistics. These snapshots have been designed to represent a picture of the situation relating to each issue and CFA, not to provide comment on or précis every single received response. However, where particular geographical features or themes are a recurring element of the relevant responses, this Report highlights these issues.

Throughout the Report, no respondent has been identified in order to avoid the impression that a particular response is judged as having more value than any other. There are however some exceptions where a significant number of responses have referenced another submission or report as a key element of their own responses. A number of responses requested confidentiality for their submissions. This request has been respected and no individual enterprise or person can be identified within this commentary.

Key issues are presented below in ranked order of comments received.

Many responses referred to numerous issues. These separate issues were logged as separate comments where appropriate. Consequently, the figure for the total comments/issues is greater than the total number of responses.

Overall, minimising the impact of the proposed route through the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) is the single greatest issue of concern for respondents to the HS2 ES.
Figure 2-1: Volume of Responses per Category

Table 2-1: Key for Issue Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AG</td>
<td>Agriculture, Forestry and Soils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH</td>
<td>Cultural Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Compensation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>Ecology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Electromagnetic Interference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN</td>
<td>General Environmental Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX</td>
<td>Expense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB</td>
<td>Green Development / Planning Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GV</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Upgrade Existing Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LL</td>
<td>Lower the Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LQ</td>
<td>Land Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV</td>
<td>Landscape and Visual Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>Mental Health / Anxiety Concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Public Consultation Process / Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>Positive for the Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV</td>
<td>Property Value</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Socio-Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU</td>
<td>Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV</td>
<td>Sound, Noise and Vibration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>Traffic and Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TU</td>
<td>Tunnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WM</td>
<td>Waste and Material Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR</td>
<td>Water Resources and Flood Risk Assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Issue 1: Tunnel - 12,637 Comments (TU)**

This is the highest ranked response issue from the complete consultation. The high numbers are due to the specific campaign demanding a full length tunnel under the Chilterns AONB (Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty) supplemented by other respondents also calling for the same feature within their responses. The second ranked tunnel campaign is for the extension of the Northolt Tunnel further westwards to minimise impacts on the Ickenham area. This tunnel is to the east of the Colne valley and AONB area.

The third ranked tunnel campaign is for the HS1 Link across Camden to be tunnelled.

There are, however, other CFAs where respondents call for additional tunnelling in their areas, either to extend an existing proposal in length or to reinstate a tunnel from a previous design exercise. These are generally concerned with minimising route impacts (visual, noise, land take, community) to an area and, where the consultation results warrant it, these are referenced in the appropriate CFA section along with the location.

**Issue 2: Community - 9,716 Comments (CM)**

The second ranked issue and one with a range of detailed responses referring to particular local impacts is that of Community. Construction impacts are the strongest concern this category, with comments on loss of amenity and quality of life in the longer term.

Disruption is a key concern with a particular complaint being the proposed length of the disruption, from works and construction activity. There is considerable concern at the degree of proposed disruption along with disagreement with the ES that construction impacts can be considered as temporary and therefore moderate. Severance of local routes and footpaths resulting in either a loss of or increasing difficulty of accessing local amenities is a common theme in both urban and rural areas.

Long term impacts and degradation of the existing surrounding area leading to loss of community amenity and creating a perceived community blight are a key issue, including loss of tranquillity, change of character and the impacts from the operation of high speed services through the area concerned. Many respondents object to being referred to as a ‘receptor’ and take this to reflect a lack of human concern for their communities.
Issue 3: Sound, Noise and Vibration - 9,330 Comments (SV)

Concern about noise impacts is the third ranked issue by volume of response. This is linked to both construction and operational phases.

Many respondents are concerned with the methodology for assessment used within the ES to underpin the assessment conclusions. Common concerns include whether the assessment parameters used are appropriate in terms of time period references (particularly the claimed use of monthly levels as a key average indicator) as well as the quality of the baseline data, any monitoring that has been undertaken and the application of appropriate noise impact levels to different geographical settings. The analysis is frequently questioned and disputed and as a result the effectiveness of any proposed mitigation measures is frequently questioned.

Night-time noise is a concern for many respondents, particularly linked to areas where construction compounds and maintenance areas are proposed. The proposed 24 hour operation of many of these sites is a concern for respondents as is the design and effectiveness of any noise barriers for compounds and route infrastructure, in particular those proposed for the viaducts.

Respondents are concerned with vibration impacts where construction traffic will affect the built environment and where tunnelling under urban and built areas will take place.

Issue 4: Public Consultation - 9,280 Comments (PC)

This issue is the fourth ranked concern in the public consultation responses. Concerns fall into three main areas: the ES, the time frame allowed for the consultation and the historical communication process between communities, individuals, organisations and HS2. Each of these is discussed in detail below.

The Environmental Statement

Many respondents begin their submissions by questioning the integrity of the ES. There is a common perception that the ES consistently underplays potential impacts and has presented issues in a manner which highlights positive outcomes.

There is substantial concern that the baseline data used in the ES is not accurate or comprehensive enough for an ES and that too much use has been made of desktop and other assumptions rather than detailed on-the-ground surveys. In addition there are comments relating to geographical and boundary errors with particular reference to maps. Respondents are concerned that errors previously highlighted in the draft ES have been replicated in this ES.

Many respondents believe that the environmental impact assessment regulations have not followed EU or UK procedure.

Many respondents believe that the lack of an SEA (Strategic Environmental Assessment) has also led to the downplaying of cumulative and wider scale impacts as well as displaying a breach of required legislation.

The ES Consultation Timeframe

Many respondents make the point that, in their opinion, the timeframe allowing respondents to access the ES reports, consider the contents and make a full and detailed response has been insufficient for a project of this scale and national importance. A particular concern has been the timing of the process over the Christmas period when many public access points were closed for a significant proportion of the consultation period and respondents also had seasonal commitments. This was noted as much by the larger organisations as by individuals and smaller organisations.
The difficulty of accessing information has been exacerbated for many respondents by the amount of cross-referencing amongst documents that readers need to follow in order to understand how the key issues for their areas were being presented in the ES. This has been commented on with a degree of cynicism as a deliberate manoeuvre by the ES proponents by many respondents.

**Project Communication**

Many respondents feel that their efforts to engage with the project have been downplayed or ignored. There is disquiet that the previous communication process was terminated and since then respondents have felt that communication has been focussed on relaying information rather than a dialogue. Many respondents are disappointed that alternative solutions that they have presented to HS2 to specific alignments and areas of local detail have not been fully considered or responded to.

Many respondents consider that they have not been consulted sufficiently on proposals which directly affect their asset holdings, particularly farmers and landowners. Some respondents who were consulted by HS2 have noted that in their opinion the content of discussions and meetings differs to what has been reported in the ES.

**Issue 5: Sustainability - 7,194 Comments (SU)**

The volume of responses for this issue has been substantially influenced by the focus on general issues relating to the concept and route as a national issue. Respondents are concerned that the measures of sustainability claimed for the HS2 option are based on flawed methodology and that the claims made for the project cannot be trusted. Respondents particularly focus on the carbon balance projected for the route and its contribution to the UK’s carbon, energy and climate change goals.

The other key areas of focus are comments on the scheme’s contribution to the national economy and transport network, questioning whether the development is an appropriate approach for delivering a sustainable economy.

Many respondents are concerned that the full scale of the project’s cumulative impacts have not been considered or assessed as part of the ES remit, with the result that the sustainability of the scheme on local and regional areas is compromised.

**Issue 6: Traffic and Transport - 5,972 Comments (TR)**

This was a highly ranked concern for many of the CFAs and reflects local concerns about the disruption and impacts from construction programme and the associated traffic flows. The effects of heavy transport on unsuitable road infrastructure and proximity to communities and sensitive environmental receptors involving all traffic impacts (for example, noise, air quality, vibration) is a key concern, as is the duration of the proposed disruption that is likely.

Concerns were also expressed about the cumulative impacts on traffic, including congestion, commuting and regional traffic flows for quality of life indicators. Respondents also raised concerns over planned road realignments and changes to highway infrastructure planned to support the construction programme. For urban areas where there are concentrations of commercial and business operations, respondents were concerned that not enough consideration had been given to the economic impacts of proposed road network changes and traffic congestion. In the rural areas, concerns were focused on severance and access across each region, for agricultural activity and community connectivity.
**Issue 7: Ecology - 5,853 Comments (EC)**

Respondents were concerned that the ecology and habitats along the route would be subject to loss and degradation, and that the natural environment will pay a heavy price along the route. Ancient woodlands were a key focus for many respondents, both for the intrinsic value of the woods themselves, for the part they have played in the regional landscape and for the amenity they provide for the local communities and wildlife.

Many respondents considered that the baseline studies undertaken for the ES were not adequate and were too heavily dependent on desk top surveys without adequate seasonal or detailed ground surveys. Concern over ecological fragmentation was a frequent theme resulting from habitat loss, disruption and the proposed fencing along the route. Respondents frequently referred to bats and barn owls although other species of local significance (fauna and flora) were also highlighted.

A frequent concern is that ecological mitigation proposals in the ES are not adequate and have not been designed in detail to reflect local situations, and that detail is lacking on long-term maintenance and responsibility. Many respondents are not convinced that replacement woodland planting as suggested is an adequate replacement for ancient woodland and the 60 year timeframe for landscape recovery quoted by many respondents is too long. Many respondents are concerned about the impact of the route and construction where the route follows green areas, crosses river valleys and potentially impacts areas where nature reserves are in operation.

**Issue 8: Water Resources - 4,787 Comments (WR)**

The number of comments on this issue has been influenced by its inclusion in a campaign which makes an unsubstantiated statement that the development of the route will affect drinking water quality.

Elsewhere, respondents are concerned about the potential impact of route infrastructure constructions will have on existing hydrological and surface water regimes with the concern that flooding could be increased both in the immediate vicinity and downstream. This concern is raised in particular where the route crosses river valleys on viaduct and embankment structures, as many respondents do not feel the plans as reported in the ES give enough detail, or that sufficient modelling has been undertaken.

Respondents are concerned that not enough detail on the design and number of proposed balancing ponds that are planned for construction has been provided in the ES.

The potential impact on the Chiltern Aquifer and chalk hydrological systems is a key concern for respondents concerned about impacts on the Chiltern AONB. This includes potential impacts from the perceived shallow nature of the proposed Chiltern Tunnel. Within the AONB area, the impacts on surface waters such as the River Misbourne are a further key concern for respondents.

**Issue 9: Air Quality - 4,649 Comments (AQ)**

Respondent concern in this issue is focussed on the potential for air quality impacts from construction traffic and construction activities. Respondents are concerned about air quality by volume in two key areas. The first is the release of quantities of dust from construction activities along the entire route and from spoil dumps and works in the Chilterns region as the chalk spoil dries in the summer months. These potential impacts are a key concern including worries over health impacts for vulnerable community members.

The second is concerned with the vehicular emissions from construction traffic and plant as well as potential congestion and traffic cumulative impacts on community air quality.
Issue 10: Landscape and Visual - 4,594 Comments (LV)

The long term impact of the route on the visual landscapes and community amenity is a key concern for many respondents. This is not limited to the Chilterns AONB but is also raised by many respondents in relation to village and community hinterlands and amenity areas. Proposed mitigation solutions in the ES are frequently questioned in respect of individual situations with particular focus on appropriate planting plans and extent. Respondents in agricultural areas in particular are concerned that proposed landscape amelioration schemes could be too extensive and that prime arable land is being sacrificed for landscape screening. The design framework for the route is also queried by many respondents, particularly for the viaduct structures along the route with many respondents wanting assurance that these structures will either blend into the landscape or represent ‘good design’.

This issue is not restricted to rural areas as respondents in more developed and urban areas are also concerned that their amenity areas are treated with respect and concern.

Issue 11: Land Quality - 3,176 Comments (LQ)

The majority of responses in this issue are focussed on construction impacts with concerns about potential contamination of ground and groundwater from works and construction compounds. Concerns are also expressed by respondents about the proposed ‘Sustainable Placement’ areas, which will be repositories for spoil from the tunnels and used for earthworks and other structures elsewhere along the route.

Many respondents express concern about the lack of detail and oversight as stated in the ES for the proposed CoCP (Code of Construction Practice, August 2012) system. Respondents are concerned that contractors will have too many opportunities to interpret standards to their advantage and that there will not be a powerful independent evaluator overseeing that CoCP practices are implemented satisfactorily and continuously across the duration of the construction period.

Issue 12: Compensation - 3,082 Comments (CO)

Many respondent concerns for compensation reference specific instances and so cannot be directly referenced in this discussion. These cover potential loss of earnings, through disruption, probable forced cancelation of investment plans, compulsory purchase issues and property blight for individual properties. Respondents range from individual householders to agricultural enterprises and commercial and businesses operations. Many respondents have issues with the proposed zones for compensation, particularly for those who are outside of the requisite zone, but feel they would still suffer blight. A common theme for urban respondents is that they feel the compensation level for rural instances is substantially higher than that for urban dwellers and that parity at least should be considered.

Respondents are concerned that communication on likely land take, land requirements, compensation levels and certainty of impacts has been lacking to date and is creating a significant level of uncertainty which is already impacting on decision making and available options.

Issue 13: Socio-economics - 2,271 Comments (SE)

While issue 12 is focussed on impacts on assets and properties, this issue is focused on potential impacts on business, economic activity and employment impacts. Many respondents believed the ES underplayed many aspects of socio-economic impact, either through inadequate research or an inbuilt approach that considered the smaller absolute numbers involved in rural areas as less important, even though these smaller numbers may proportionally be more significant for their respective communities.
Respondents also question the economic modelling for towns and communities and effect of cumulative impacts on economic activity during the lengthy construction period. Respondents in the Chiltern AONB particularly feel that the importance of Tourism to the local economies could be jeopardised by the route impacts and lengthy construction period. Respondents in North London are also concerned about the potential negative impact on the local economies and tourism. Respondents in a number of CFAs are concerned at the likely influx of construction workers for extended periods in the construction compounds and the strains, economic and social, that could arise in the smaller communities as a consequence.

**Issue 14: Expense - 1,999 Comments (EX)**

Respondents in this category were concerned over the cost of the HS2 project and in particular its potential share of national expenditure and the impact that this may have on other budgets and investments for the future. Respondents were also sceptical about the value that this project represented for the nation compared to other options favoured by the respondent.

**Issue 15: Agriculture, Forestry and Soils - 1,940 Comments (AG)**

Respondents for this issue are particularly concerned with land take and the impacts this would have on economic performance, severance and access across landholdings, and the viability of current operations once construction programmes begin. Many respondents have questioned the ES philosophy of mitigation, particular on the extent of planting as landscape compensation on prime arable land. The lengthy construction period is also a major concern for respondents in this category.

**Issue 16: Cultural Heritage - 1,277 Comments (CH)**

Respondents for this issue referenced potential impacts on specific cultural assets which include buildings and their surrounding estates, generally Grade I or Grade II listed archaeological features – known or suspected, community buildings and features of importance to that particular community, and structures within the urban landscape. Featured assets were referenced in the ES, and respondent concerns focus on particular issues including long term potential route impact on the asset, socio-economic impact for visitor numbers and access during the construction period and operation, and landscape and amenity impact. Many respondents are concerned that alternative alignment solutions presented to the HS2 design team have not been considered fully for the designs as proposed in the ES.

Where particular cultural heritage assets became a feature of CFA responses, these are referenced in the relevant CFA section.

**Issue 17: Upgrade Existing Infrastructure - 884 Comments (IN)**

The majority of these responses called for upgrading of the existing West Coast Main Line as an alternative to investing in the HS2 Infrastructure project. A minority of respondents called for the upgrading of the Marylebone – Chilterns line as an alternative to the HS2 Infrastructure project.

**Issue 18: Other - 872 Comments**

Respondents in this category demonstrated a wide range of concerns that respondents wished to express in the ES consultation process. Many made reference to a viewpoint that technological advances in communication would likely render the proposed rail infrastructure superfluous in the future. Others were concerned that China could be involved in financing and constructing the project and that British jobs should be guaranteed for the project workforce.

Construction issues are also a focus of concern in this category and included health and safety issues, security and the possible increase of vermin into surrounding areas as a result of construction disturbance.
Issue 19: General Environmental Issues - 858 Comments (EN)
This category captures responses which submitted general comments and expressions about the Environment without relating the comment to any particular issue, supporting details or CFA. Comments comprised negative remarks or slogans such as ‘Environmentally irresponsible’ and ‘no Environmental case’.

Issue 20: Lower the Line - 768 Comments (LL)
Responses in this issue mainly refer to a campaign calling for lowering the line beneath the West Coast Main Line and A38 near Lichfield to minimise impacts in this area. Some other respondents across the route also call for lowering of the line in specific areas to minimise impacts on dwellings and landscapes in their particular area.

Issue 21: Waste and Material Resources - 604 Comments (WM)
Respondents were concerned over the scale and management of the ‘Sustainable Placement’ proposals for spoil, along with waste transport issues and potential contamination from spoil dumps.

Issue 22: Property Values - 511 Comments (PV)
This category references responses where the respondent particularly highlighted route impacts on individual property value and blight related to property value concerns.

Issue 23: Mental Health - 411 Comments (MH)
Respondents in this category referenced concerns for individual wellbeing and stress resulting from the long term duration of the construction period, uncertainty over outcomes and potential impacts from potential negative impacts on business or property ownership.

Issue 24: Not Specified - 365 Comments (NS)
This category captures those responses that submitted remarks and slogans of a general nature, were unsigned and unmarked campaign postcards, or concerned other matters outside the scope of this consultation. Unsigned and unmarked campaign postcards and responses providing expressions and slogans of general dissatisfaction such as ‘No HS2’ unsupported by additional commentary make up the bulk of this category. The category also included junk mail material sent to the consultation address, misdirected messages and advertising flyers.

Issue 25: Government - 334 Comments (GV)
Respondents in this category referenced comments on perceived national government intentions and approach for the proposed route infrastructure, often along with a stated intent on future voting intentions.

Issue 26: Electromagnetic Interference - 169 Comments (EM)
Concern was expressed by respondents in this category that safeguarding of electromagnetic interference had not been adequately addressed in the ES proposed designs. This issue was generally raised by commercial operations along the route that need to safeguard their systems and operations from electromagnetic interference and disruption.

Issue 27: Positive for the Line - 87 Comments (Pos)
Respondents in this category expressed support for the HS2 concept and the benefits that the line could bring to the national economy. The majority of these responses were followed by a particular concern relating to a relevant CFA.
Issue 28: Greenbelt Development - 76 Comments (GB)

Respondents in this category were concerned about the potential cumulative impacts on greenbelt by opening up areas for development, and enabling further impacts and commercial applications to be implemented to the detriment of these protected areas.
2.2 Community Forum Areas (CFAs)

This section of the Report presents the results from the Public Consultation related to the geographical/spatial groupings along the proposed route. Not all submissions referred specifically to a relevant CFA designation, although the project team were able to relate many submissions to the appropriate CFA through references to local settlements and features mentioned in the text.

The CFAs are taken from the ES and the Independent Assessor has decided to apply the same categorisation for ease of reference with HS2 project material. This section presents results by CFA as well as further categories to reflect wider geographical areas where submission responses were directed, as well as those further specific geographical areas referenced in the ES. General comments concerning the entire route or project philosophy are also discussed in this section.

Each CFA section presents results by volume, issue and response type. The results are presented in the following pages in numerical order rather than ‘hot spot’ order. Table 2-2 below presents the ranking of CFAs and geographical issues by volume of responses received.

The areas along the route with the largest volume of public responses were the Chilterns, London from Euston through to Kilburn, the Colne Valley and the West Coast Main Line connection near Lichfield.

### Table 2-2: Responses per Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CFA1</td>
<td>764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFA2</td>
<td>2,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFA3</td>
<td>729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFA4</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFA5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFA6</td>
<td>2,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFA7</td>
<td>2,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFA8</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFA9</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFA10</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFA11</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFA12</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFA13</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFA14</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFA15</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFA16</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFA17</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFA18</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFA19</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFA20</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFA21</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFA22</td>
<td>1,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFA23</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFA24</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each CFA listing uses the description used by the ES. Each CFA is also related to its section and page numbers in the Non-Technical Summary document of the ES as a convenient gateway to the key issues referenced in the ES.
2.2.1 CFA 1 – Euston - Station and Approach

ES NTS REF: Section 8.1, Page 54

There were 764 comments relating to this CFA

Figure 2-2: CFA1 - Response Type

Figure 2-3: CFA1 - Environmental Topics
The issues raised from the responses in this highly developed CFA are particularly concerned with the impacts of long term construction on the existing communities, residents, building assets and infrastructure fabric and cumulative impacts across the area.

The highest category of response concerned Community amenity which was also closely related in the content of the responses to the second highest category Traffic and Transport. A key concern for respondents in this CFA is the likely disruption to the area from all forms of construction activity, which is expected to be of large scale and long duration. Respondents are particularly concerned about the impacts on existing traffic flows, access, environmental impacts such as air quality, noise and vibration and construction ‘blight’ across the area. This also extends to wider traffic management and cumulative impacts on transportation disruption for all modes of transport. These issues are demonstrated in the top 5 ranked issues for this CFA.

The plans for Euston station itself are a common theme of discussion, with the ‘Double Deck down’ proposal frequently cited as a missed opportunity and many questions are raised about the economic decisions surrounding the current proposed station designs. The Euston debate also frequently raises the alternative location of an HS2 terminal elsewhere, particularly for the Old Oak Common area.

Respondents continually highlight that in their opinion there is not enough information in the ES relating to the planning and impacts for this CFA. Community relations with HS2 frequently discuss a lack of trust in the development process from residents, businesses and stakeholders.

Tunnelling itself remains a potent issue with respondents both in favour of and against additional tunnelling. Potential impacts from tunnelling on structural property assets is a common theme as is the theme of compensation and the management of potential threat to existing housing and residents. There is a smaller concern with tunnel ventilation shafts affecting visual quality.

The potential threat to existing community amenities such as Camden Market is a frequent theme as is concern with impacts on cultural heritage, particularly for buildings.
2.2.2 CFA 2 – Camden and HS1 Link
ES NTS REF: Section 8.2, Page 61
There were 2,886 comments relating to this CFA

Figure 2-4: CFA2 – Response Type

Figure 2-5: CFA2 - Environmental Topics
CFA 2 has some of the densest residential and building stock of any of the CFAs within the proposed route alignment. Consequently this CFA has the fifth highest volume of responses received during this Public Consultation exercise. Community Disruption ranks highest amongst the concerns expressed, with related issues also in the next highest rankings. Considerable concern is expressed about the proposed duration of the construction disruption and the effects this will have on quality of life, environmental impacts, economic activity for local business and traffic routing and anticipated congestion.

Compensation and blight on residential housing is the second highest concern with many respondents commenting on a perceived disparity of compensation levels ‘between urban and rural areas’ with claims that the urban areas are being offered lowered levels of redress.

The third highest ranking concern is the issue of Public Consultation, where respondents express their lack of trust in the communication process to date and a strong feeling that previously expressed local responses concerning the detailed route design and proposed construction approaches have been inadequately considered in the ES.

Tunnelling is also a frequent theme with many respondents requesting more effort be spent looking at the options to extend tunnels in the area, although some concern is also expressed about the potential of surface impacts on housing stock from sub-surface engineering.

In common with neighbouring CFA 1, the development of Euston Station and its associated impacts is also questioned with many respondents indicating a preference for the Double Deck Down design option or relocating the terminus of HS2 to Old Oak Common.

The HS1 link is mainly mentioned in connection with concerns about community upheaval and disruption and construction impacts although amongst some of the supportive comments the HS1 link as proposed in the current plans is seen as not fit for purpose given it’s likely capacity as a single line and should be designed as a double track structure.

Concern over environmental impacts are focussed on construction and disruption issues – air quality, noise and dust along with a distinct concern over potential impacts on the local nature reserve of Adelaide Park.
2.2.3 CFA 3 – Primrose Hill to Kilburn (Camden)
ES NTS REF: Section 8.3, Page 65
There were 729 comments relating to this CFA

Figure 2-6: CFA3 – Response Type

Figure 2-7: CFA3 - Environmental Issues
The HS2 route will be in a tunnel throughout this CFA. However there will be two ventilation shafts and construction compounds (for wider route construction) located within the CFA. Activities associated with the construction and operation of these facilities form the majority of the highly ranked issues within this CFA. As this is a residential and urban area, respondents are particularly concerned about construction impacts, the duration of construction activity and the upheaval and disruption this is likely to cause in their area including for local business and economic activity.

Concern is expressed about the potential impacts the tunnelling could have on property, foundations, vibration and disturbance. The proposed ventilation shafts are a constant element of concern particularly for impacts on the Adelaide Road Nature Reserve which is seen as an important local amenity, for residents of surrounding CFAs as well as CFA 3.

Respondents claim that cumulative impacts have not been adequately addressed and in common with residents of surrounding CFAs are not convinced that preliminary surveys have been sufficient for planning and decision making. Inadequate mitigation is a common theme, the loss of community amenity and concern that the ES has not fully addressed the detailed implications of construction activity in the CFA.
2.2.4 CFA 4 – Kilburn (Brent) to Old Oak Common

ES NTS REF: Section 8.4, Page 69

There were 275 comments relating to this CFA

Figure 2-8: CFA4 - Response Type

Figure 2-9: CFA4 - Environmental Issues
As a primarily residential area, the highest ranked concern in CFA 4 is the Community impacts, with a particular focus on construction impacts, disruption, upheaval and loss of amenity. Concern about the long term impacts from construction activities include pollution, air quality and disruption of access to local transport routes and the impact on local infrastructure. A common theme from respondents is the feeling that the ES has a lack of detail on specific impacts, mitigation measures and management plans to deal with these issues.

Cumulative impacts, particularly on existing traffic and transport are seen as a key issue which respondents feel has not been fully addressed in the ES. CFA 4 already has a substantial amount of rail infrastructure and a number of respondents, including those with a direct interest in this aspect, are concerned about the proposals which could impact existing operations.

Ecology is the third ranked issue for this CFA. This is in response to proposed plans to create a compensatory wetland area on Wormwood Scrubs. Respondents are unclear on the reasoning for the creation of this area and concerned that long term commitment to maintain the wetland will not continue. In addition, the respondents are concerned that the proposed area will negatively impact on existing community amenity of Wormwood Scrubs in its present form and use.

Compensation as currently offered is a key concern, focused on individual instances and situations, with many worried that there are insufficient guarantees for residents and unclear about how the situation will proceed. Business is also concerned about this issue and about impacts that could affect the commercial viability of existing operations. Blight from the construction disturbance is a key concern.

Many respondents comment that there has not been enough public liaison with HS2 concerning potential impacts and addressing local issues and concerns.

The route in CFA 4 includes substantial tunnel sections, and the proposed ventilation shafts in Queens Park and Brent are a concern for respondents in these areas, particularly for visual impact and the associated operational facilities.
2.2.5 CFA 5 – Northolt Corridor
ES NTS REF: Section 8.5, Page 74
There were 50 comments relating to this CFA

Figure 2-10: CFA5 - Response Type

Figure 2-11: CFA5 - Environmental Issues
The HS2 route will be running in a tunnel throughout this CFA. This may have influenced the smaller volume of responses received concerned with this CFA compared to neighbouring CFA’s. Those that have been received are mainly from commercial operations who are concerned with potential disruptive activity to their premises from construction and works sites associated with the proposed three tunnel ventilation shafts within this CFA. This includes potential property blight, noise and vibration from construction and tunnel usage and protection of existing cables. The majority of respondents would like to see an increase in communication and liaison with HS2 over the construction proposals.
2.2.6 CFA 6 – South Ruislip to Ickenham
ES NTS REF: Section 8.6, Page 76
There were 2,617 comments relating to this CFA

Figure 2-12: CFA6 - Response Type

Figure 2-13: CFA6 - Environmental Issues
The majority of responses received for this CFA are campaign postcards that focus on Ickenham and Ruislip and also Harefield which is in CFA 7. Other submissions which are not postcards follow similar issues, with variation of comments displayed in this CFA generally coming from respondent additions to the base postcards. This CFA is the fourth highest ranking CFA by volume of response.

Concerns and comments are therefore concentrated on the western area of this CFA where the line runs through countryside and across a 3.4 km long viaduct near Harefield (CFA 7). The campaign highlights a number of concerns including the impact of the route on the general amenity for residents, impacts on local leisure facilities and footpaths and the impacts of the viaduct (referred to as either the Harefield or Colne Valley viaduct), including both the construction impacts as well as ongoing noise impacts during operation. Some responses are concerned that the level of detail presented in the ES is not adequate particularly stating that the height and extent of proposed noise barriers on the viaduct is unclear.

Construction impacts, particularly resulting from construction traffic creating noise and air quality effects are seen as a significant issue along with a concern about the placement and extent of ‘materials’, referred to also as ‘waste’ on the postcards and referring to the storage and re-use of excavated spoil from the tunnelling works and London to the east. There is also concern that contaminated materials will be treated and stored in a particular location near Breakspear Road South.

Impacts on current local traffic flows are anticipated to be severe with congestion anticipated.

The campaign also raises concerns over the public consultation process, with the time given for assimilating the necessary ES information as being insufficient. The campaign also claims that some of the data used to inform the ES is out of date, for example it indicates that traffic analysis data is out of date, and there is more recent data available.
2.2.7  CFA 7 – Colne Valley
ES NTS REF: Section 8.7, Page 79
There were 2,697 comments relating to this CFA

Figure 2-14: CFA7 - Response Type

Figure 2-15: CFA7 - Environmental Issues
The majority of responses received for this CFA are campaign postcards (as discussed in CFA 6 above). Other submissions follow similar issues, suggesting that they are aware of the campaign with variation of comments displayed in this CFA generally coming from respondents’ additions to the base postcard.

The campaign highlights a number of concerns including the impact of the route on the general amenity for residents, including impacts on local leisure facilities and footpaths and the impacts of the Colne Valley viaduct, including both the construction impacts as well as ongoing noise impacts during operation. Some responses are concerned that the level of detail presented in the ES is not adequate, particularly stating that the height and extent of proposed noise barriers on the viaduct is unclear.

Construction impacts, particularly resulting from construction traffic creating noise and affecting air quality, is seen as a significant issue along with a concern about the placement and extent of ‘materials’, referred to also as ‘waste’ referring to the storage and re-use of excavated spoil from the tunnelling works and London to the East.

Impacts on current local traffic flows are anticipated to be severe with congestion anticipated.

Concerns are also raised over the public consultation process, with the time given for assimilating the necessary ES information as being insufficient. Respondents claim that some of the data used to inform the ES is out of date, for example it indicates that traffic analysis data is out of date, and there is more recent data available. Other respondents also claim a lack of consultation has occurred.

CFA 7 is in Metropolitan Greenbelt and concerns are expressed about the potential impacts on the areas of ‘tranquility’ and landscape with a key concern being that ‘the character of the area will be lost forever’. Some respondents have expressed concern about misleading photomontages where old trees re-appear in the reconstructed landscapes.

A key feature of this CFA is the landscape of the River Colne and associated water features, essentially a series of lakes which are used for fishing, leisure and community amenity. Concerns about potential impacts on water quality from the viaduct construction are raised as well as longer term water level impacts, access to lake areas and potential flooding risks downstream from the route infrastructure as it crosses the Colne Valley.
2.2.8 CFA 8 – The Chalfonts and Amersham

ES NTS REF: Section 8.8, Page 83

There were 155 comments relating to this CFA

Figure 2-16: CFA8 - Response Types

Figure 2-17: CFA8 - Environmental Issues
The route infrastructure of HS2 runs through this area in a 13.5 km tunnel known as the Chiltern Tunnel. Respondent concerns for this CFA particularly focus on the potential impacts and disruption from construction activities in relation to the tunnel, with traffic issues from heavy construction plant forming the highest ranked concern for responses in this CFA. Respondents from the villages of Chalfont St Giles and Chalfont St Peter are concerned about traffic impacts on their communities and are concerned that there do not seem to be effective mitigation measures being considered to ease this issue.

There are also concerns that these traffic impacts will disrupt and impact businesses and economic activity in Amersham and that the increased construction traffic and its nature will negatively impact the current amenity the community enjoys in this area.

The Tunnel will require 3 ventilation shafts as it crosses through this CFA. All three shafts, the Chalfont St Peter Vent Shaft, Chalfont St Giles Vent Shaft and Amersham Vent Shaft are mentioned in terms of potential construction traffic impacts, visual impact and community disruption. The long time frames being proposed for construction and its attendant disruption are a source of frustration for many respondents.

The third ranked issue in this CFA expresses concerns about the short length of time that the ES was available to respondents for consideration. This is combined with a general feeling that the ES lacks detail and accuracy in assumptions in many key areas of relevance to this CFA.

Another key issue raised in this CFA is water resources. Concern is expressed about the possible impacts of the tunnel under the River Misbourne, the Chilterns Chalk Aquifer and Shardloe Lake, an area of community amenity. Respondents are worried that the tunnel will be too shallow in this area and will permanently damage these hydrological assets. They are not convinced that the level of detail expressed in the ES gives them confidence that the protection of this resource will be assured.
2.2.9 CFA 9 – Central Chilterns

ES NTS REF: Section 8.9, Page 86

There were 248 comments relating to this CFA

![Pie chart showing response type distribution]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Letter/email, 1 page with no standard text</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter/email, 1 page with some standard text</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter/email, 11-50 pages inc. with no standard text</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter/email, 11-50 pages inc. with some standard text</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter/email, 2-5 pages inc. with no standard text</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter/email, 2-5 pages inc. with some standard text</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter/email, 6-10 pages inc. with no standard text</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter/email, 6-10 pages inc. with some standard text</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter/email, over 50 pages with no standard text</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter/email, over 50 pages with some standard text</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcard with some standard text</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard ES Public Response Form</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Bar chart showing environmental issues]

Figure 2-18: CFA9 - Response Type

Figure 2-19: CFA9 - Environmental Issues
CFA 9 is in the heart of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and the responses received from this CFA are extremely concerned about a number of potential impacts on this area. A large number of responses call for the extension of the proposed tunnel through the area, thus supporting the tunnel for the Chilterns campaign included in the geographical section ‘Chilterns’ of this Report. The highest ranking issue of importance for this CFA is Traffic and Transport, concerning the likely impacts of construction traffic and its associated environmental impacts on air quality, noise and potential disruption.

The impacts of construction on the local communities in the area are of great concern, with the quality of life and amenity for the communities of Little Missenden, South Heath and Potter Row in particular, especially for the planned duration of disruption across these communities. The likely negative impact on tourism in the area and the knock-on effect on the local economy and businesses is also a key concern for these communities. The community amenity of footpaths and ancient bridleways including well known routes (e.g. Icknield Way, Chilterns Way, Ridgeway) being subject to potential disruption and alteration is another concern.

With a mixture of tunnels and surface infrastructure for the route in this CFA, landscape and visual impacts (fourth highest ranked issue) on the AONB landscape are a key concern. Respondents query the application of a number of national legislation instruments designed to protect AONB areas from development, such as the Countryside and Rights of Way (CRoW) Act and National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), and many respondents remain convinced that the ES documentation is an ‘Engineering led document, not an Environmental document’.

The proposed impact on historic landscapes, woodlands, hedgerows and heritage structures in this CFA is another key concern. Respondents are not convinced that the ES has enough ecological survey detail to support the projects proposals for this area and that ecological damage is likely not just from development but also from fencing along the route creating ecological fragmentation for local fauna.

A common theme is that the respondents do not feel they had enough time to fully understand or navigate the documents making up the ES with concern that preservation and conservation for the AONB has not been fully addressed.
2.2.10  CFA 10 – Dunsmore, Wendover and Halton

ES NTS REF: Section 8.10, Page 90

There were 216 comments relating to this CFA

Figure 2-20: CFA10 - Response Type

Figure 2-21: CFA10 - Environmental Issues
CFA 10 is within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and the potential impact of the HS2 route on the area is a key concern. Many respondents feel that the ES for this CFA is ‘reliant on optimistic assumptions and desk research’ and that the ‘significance of the impacts on the AONB have been understated’. Many respondents also feel that considerable further survey work is required in a variety of environmental areas (woodlands, hedgerows, flora and fauna) before discussions of realistic impacts and mitigation options.

The highest ranked issue in this CFA is the desire to tunnel under the complete AONB, thus avoiding many of the potential impacts on the area.

Construction disruption and impacts on traffic, air quality, dust and noise is the second ranked issue with concerns about loss of community amenity, connectivity, upheaval and nuisance from all the communities who have submitted material. Wendover, Dunsmore and Halton are all concerned about these immediate impacts and long term nature of the potential disruption. Chalk based dust from construction spoil is seen as a likely key nuisance during the construction period. A key concern is the effectiveness and policing of the proposed Code of Construction Practice (COCP), with many respondents requiring assurances that the monitoring of the COCP will be handled by an independent body of great integrity.

Landscape and visual effects rank highly in this CFA as the line in this section of the AONB is substantially on the surface including features such as cuttings and 2 viaducts, only using a section of tunnel in the proximity of Wendover. Impacts on views from hills and surrounding areas and concerns about significant loss of landscape character were a common theme in responses. The viaducts at Wendover Dean and Small Dean are frequently mentioned with requests that the structures should at least be designed to minimise blighting the landscape.

The statements in the ES concerning ‘Sustainable Placement’ of spoil are looked on with scepticism by many respondents concerning the use of ‘sustainable’ in this context. The proposed spoil placement site near Hunts Green is considered unacceptable in the AONB.

Many submissions concern the potential impacts on the rural, agricultural and farming community in this CFA. Potential negative economic impacts include putting pressure on the viability of local business and farming sectors.

Many respondents cite the timescale for public responses to the ES, and the accessibility of the ES documentation as inadequate.
2.2.11 CFA 11 – Stoke Mandeville and Aylesbury

ES NTS REF: Section 8.11, Page 94

There were 214 comments relating to this CFA

Figure 2-22: CFA11 - Response Type

Figure 2-23: CFA11 - Environmental Issues
Respondents in this CFA express deep concern over the public consultation process as conducted to date, along with construction traffic and disruption and noise issues from construction and route operation. These three issues are almost equally ranked together as the highest concern by volume of responses.

Disquiet with the consultation process focusses on the time available for respondents to obtain, read and understand the documentation, access to the documents and the timing of the consultation process. Many noted that the consultation period extended over Christmas when many respondents claimed they found it more difficult to access copies of material over a busy personal time and when many public access points were closed. There was also concern that the ES ‘raised more questions’ than it answered with new proposals and alignments and impact statements. The effectiveness of the public communication activities throughout was also raised.

Construction traffic, and the impacts on main and rural road networks across the area are of great concern including the likely disruption of existing access routes, satellite construction compounds and environmental impacts arising from these activities.

Noise issues ranked highly in this CFA, reflecting residential concern over proposed mitigation designs for the line itself when operational, with many commenting that ‘noise mitigation should take priority over visual mitigation’ when these mitigations have the potential to be in conflict. However, landscape issues are still of high importance for the respondents of this CFA and the associated potential impacts on existing agricultural activities, wildlife and water resources are of great concern.

Many respondents linked their submissions to agree with alternative proposals to limit the impact of the route in the vicinity of Hartwell House, a Grade I listed structure and grounds. Concern for this particular cultural heritage asset ensured that this issue ranked highly amongst the submissions received. There was also concern that alternative routes suggested by public depositions (also for more westerly alignments elsewhere in this CFA) had not been subject to appropriate discussion, analysis or feedback.

Effective mitigation is a key concern in discussions of the impacts and many respondents expressed their desire that the COCP should be an essential component which requires strengthening to the community’s satisfaction.
2.2.12 CFA 12 – Waddesdon and Quainton
ES NTS REF: Section 8.12, Page 98
There were 90 comments relating to this CFA

![Response Type Pie Chart]

**Figure 2-24: CFA12 - Response Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Type</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Letter/email, 1 page with no standard text</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter/email, 11-50 pages inc. with no standard text</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter/email, 11-50 pages inc. with some standard text</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter/email, 2-5 pages inc. with no standard text</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter/email, 2-5 pages inc. with some standard text</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter/email, 6-10 pages inc. with no standard text</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter/email, 6-10 pages inc. with some standard text</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter/email, over 50 pages with no standard text</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter/email, over 50 pages with some standard text</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcard with some standard text</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard ES Public Response Form</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Environmental Issues Bar Chart]

**Figure 2-25: CFA12 - Environmental Issues**
CFA 12 is located in the open landscape of the Vale of Aylesbury. The highest ranked issue in this CFA is the Agriculture, Forestry and Soils category which for this CFA incorporates concerns about impacts on farming, land take of agricultural sites and impacts on access across farm lands.

The second highest ranking is the Public Consultation issue, with respondents concerned over the lack of available time to assess and access the ES documentation and the communication process between local communities and HS2. Concerns over the quality of the ES and the claimed ‘rushed nature’ of the process are also of concern.

Ecological issues forms the third highest ranking in this CFA particularly focused on comments concerning the methodologies used to survey and assess the route areas and on the proposed impacts on Sheephouse Wood, which, as many respondents point out, is a location known for the rare Bechstein Bat.

Construction traffic, its associated environmental impacts and the likely long term disruption to quality of life and community issues is a concern for all respondents in this CFA along with noise and the effectiveness of proposed noise mitigation solutions for the line when in operation.

This CFA is also the location for two sites of cultural heritage which are consistently mentioned in responses – Waddesdon Manor and Doddershall House. Both are listed properties and form an important component for the local economy in terms of visitors.
2.2.13 CFA 13 – Calvert, Steeple Claydon, Twyford and Chetwode
ES NTS REF: Section 8.13, Page 101
There were 215 comments relating to this CFA

Figure 2-26: CFA13 - Response Type

Figure 2-27: CFA13 - Environmental Issues
Issues within this CFA are focused around four particular proposed installations and areas. These are the proposed HS2 Infrastructure Maintenance Depot (IMD) and the proposed land take for spoil near Shepherds Farm in between Calvert and Steeple Claydon, and the communities of Twyford and Chetwode. These elements make up the majority of responses received for this CFA.

Although noise features are the highest ranked issue for this CFA, it is really made up of two components: the concerns over likely noise impacts from the IMD near Calvert and line operational impacts on the rural areas of Twyford and Chetwode.

Respondents are concerned over the development plans for the proposed IMD and the relocation of the current FCC Waste operation to increase its impact over the community of Calvert in particular. Residents are also concerned that 24 hour operation will be practised by the IMD, with associated noise and vibration, air quality and light pollution. In addition to this, the relocation of the FCC waste operation closer to the village of Calvert is expected to increase odour issues. Taken together, there is a real concern amongst residents of both communities that they will experience a ‘reduction in quality of life’ and substantial upheaval in what is currently a quiet rural area.

Respondents are also concerned about the proposed ‘Sustainable Placement’ area for tunnelling spoil near Shepherds Furze Farm as an additional imposition on their landscape.

Negative impacts on ecology, agricultural enterprises and landscape and visual impacts are frequently raised by respondents. The construction and operation of the route in the vicinity of Twyford and Chetwode is seen as creating long term disruption to the communities and potential noise and visual impacts. The route infrastructure is seen as affecting the setting of the communities and quality of life in a detrimental way.

Many respondents state that they did not have enough time to assess the ES documentation and that accessing the necessary material was difficult in the time available. In addition, many respondents feel aggrieved at inadequate communication and discussion concerning the IMD proposals prior to the release of the ES. Mitigation remains a concern along with the potential of the route infrastructure to adversely influence flooding events.
2.2.14  CFA 14 – Newton Purcell to Brackley

ES NTS REF: Section 8.14, Page 105

There were 179 comments relating to this CFA

Figure 2-28: CFA14 - Response Type

Figure 2-29: CFA14 - Environmental Issues
CFA 14 is a mainly rural area and respondents are focused on the potential impacts that their own communities and parishes within this CFA are likely to face from the proposed HS2 route. The highest ranked issue for this CFA is concerned with the potential disruption and impacts from construction traffic and associated environmental and transportation impacts. This includes access issues and any increases in heavy plant and lorry journeys within the area. This is a frequently expressed concern in this CFA, particularly in relation to cumulative impacts that may arise across the existing ‘A’ road network, some proposed road re-alignments and construction traffic through villages.

Respondents are also concerned about the construction sites and ancillary areas which may involve noise disruption from plant operation and light pollution.

Noise effects from the operation of the line in combination with construction noise makes noise the second ranked issue of concern in this CFA. Questions are raised about the methodologies and assumptions made by the noise modelling in the ES and the appropriateness and effectiveness of proposed noise mitigation measures suggested.

Loss of amenity for the community is raised frequently by respondents and is the third ranked issue. As a rural area, quality of life is important for residents and potential future blight on lifestyle, landscape and property is a key concern.

Concerns over the consultation process focus on the time available for respondents to obtain, read and understand the documentation, access to the documents and the timing of the consultation process. Many noted that the period extended over Christmas when many respondents claimed they found it more difficult to access copies of material over a busy personal time and when many public access points were closed. There was also concern that the ES ‘raised more questions’ than it answered with new proposals and alignments and impact statements. The language used in the report was also seen to be non-committal and details were lacking.

Respondents in Radstone were mystified as to why the original alignment had been changed in the ES to a position closer to the village, when the original could potentially avoid most of their current concerns. Turweston respondents claim that power lines are now going to be re-aligned closer to their village creating more unwanted impacts. Turweston cutting also appeared as a key feature in the responses with requests for the original cut and cover tunnel to be re-instated.

Concern for bats and barn owls is highlighted in particular, combined with a view that the ES did not present sufficient baseline data to inform assessment and mitigation. The proposed earthworks storage site near Brackley was also a frequent issue and agriculture enterprises were concerned about potential impacts on their viability, land access and heritage.
2.2.15  CFA 15 – Greatworth to Lower Boddington
ES NTS REF: Section 8.15, Page 108
There were 135 comments relating to this CFA

Figure 2-30: CFA15 - Response Type

Figure 2-31: CFA15 - Environmental Issues
CFA 15 is a mainly rural area and respondents are focused on the potential impacts that their own communities and parishes within this CFA are likely to face from the proposed HS2 route. The highest ranked issue for this CFA is the potential disruption from construction traffic and associated environmental and transportation impacts. This includes access issues and any increases in heavy plant and lorry journeys within the area. This is a frequently expressed concern across the CFA, particularly in relation to cumulative impacts that may arise across the existing road network, and there is also concern over the suitability of many proposed roads and construction traffic through villages.

Respondents are also concerned about the construction sites and ancillary areas which may involve disruption from noise and light pollution. Difficulty with the management of the two construction camps in the parish of Lower Boddington under the CoCP proposals was a frequently raised issue.

Noise from the operation of the line in combination with construction noise makes noise the second ranked issue of concern in this CFA. Questions are raised about the methodologies and assumptions made by the noise modelling in the ES and the appropriateness and effectiveness of proposed noise mitigation measures.

Loss of amenity for the community is raised frequently by respondents and is the third ranked issue. Quality of life is important for residents in this CFA and potential future blight on lifestyle, landscape and property is a key concern.

Concerns over the consultation process focus on the time available for respondents to access, read and understand the documentation, and on the timing of the consultation process. Many noted that the period extended over Christmas when many respondents claimed they found it more difficult to access copies of material over a busy personal time and when many public access points were closed. There was also concern that the ES ‘raised more questions’ than it answered, with new proposals and alignments. The language used in the ES was seen to be non-committal. The effectiveness of the public communication activities throughout was also raised.

The CFA has a number of springs and watercourses within it and the potential disturbance to the area’s hydrological character has concerned many respondents.

Concern for bats and barn owls was highlighted in particular, combined with the view that the ES did not present sufficient baseline data to inform assessment and mitigation. There was concern by many rural respondents that displacement of existing fauna, especially badgers, could result in an increase in TB in farming livestock. Issues around the proposals for temporary land take were also a key concern, especially since many respondents felt that the phrase ‘temporary’ was used in a cavalier manner in the ES.

The design for the proposed Greatworth tunnel was raised in many responses as it was felt that a modest extension to this structure could alleviate many of the likely impacts on the community.
2.2.16  CFA 16 – Ladbroke and Southam

ES NTS REF: Section 8.16, Page 112
There were 211 comments relating to this CFA

Figure 2-32: CFA16 - Response Type

Figure 2-33: CFA16 - Environmental Issues
The dominant focus of responses from this CFA is impact on the community of Southam.

The responses focus on traffic and transport from proposed construction activities, community loss of quality of life, the impact on local business and economic activity including agriculture, the impacts on woods and the local Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) of Long Itchington Wood, and aspects of flood risk, air quality and potential light pollution. Some submissions relate to the same issues but the focus is wider across the area although with Southam still as the principal focus.

Other responses are more detailed on key issues and concerns for this CFA. These include the disruption to local communities from construction traffic, and the use of unsuitable roads and access routes, farming community concerns about access and viability, visual and landscape effects and the potential impact on water balance and flooding propensities in the existing hydrological regime.

The perceived deficiencies of the consultation (for example, its timing and access to documentation) were a common theme. Consultation processes were seen as inadequate as were the baseline investigations for the ES and much of the ES information on effects and mitigation.

The value of Long Itchington Wood was a common theme, with concerns expressed about the proposed tunnel under the wood and its effects on water balance systems on the wood. Social issues arising from a construction workforce coming into a rural area were a concern.
### 2.2.17 CFA 17 – Offchurch and Cubbington

ES NTS REF: Section 8.17, Page 115

There were 56 comments relating to this CFA

![Figure 2-34: CFA17 - Response Type](image1)

![Figure 2-35: CFA17 - Environmental Issues](image2)
Respondents in this CFA are concerned with the disruption from construction activities on their quality of life along with permanent land take by the route and the impacts the route will have on the rural character of the area. Construction traffic, with its associated environmental impacts and road re-alignments are of key concern for many respondents who are worried about community blight. Severance of routes for roads, footpaths and bridleways are cited as issues for many residents who are used to taking walks, horse riding and enjoying the countryside. Severance is also an issue for respondents from the farming community, with economic concerns over land access, and many question the proposed tree planting proposals which are thought to be using too much productive arable land.

Landscape and visual impacts are of key concern with respondents particularly citing issues with the proposed track heights across this CFA. The feature of South Cuddington Wood, an ancient woodland, is a particular focus with many requesting a tunnel underneath the wood. There is also an issue with a veteran pear tree in a hedgerow south of the wood, which many respondents are concerned about.

Respondents are also concerned over the potential impacts of the route infrastructure on the surface water drainage in the area, with flood risk protection the fourth ranked issue in this CFA.

Respondents believe that the time available to them to access, study and respond to the ES documentation has been insufficient and that the timing of the consultation period over Christmas made their task even harder. Dissatisfaction with the community consultation process throughout the project to date is evident in the majority of the received responses.
2.2.18  CFA 18 – Stoneleigh, Kenilworth and Burton Green

ES NTS REF: Section 8.18, Page 118

There were 138 comments relating to this CFA

Figure 2-36: CFA18 - Response Types

Figure 2-37: CFA18 - Environmental Issues
Respondents in this CFA are particularly concerned with the cumulative impacts that the proposed construction activities will have on community amenity, traffic volumes and associated environmental impacts, and quality of life. Many highlight the disruption to cycleways and access routes, in particular the ‘Greenway’ route which is used by many cyclists between Kenilworth and the University of Warwick. Even if these routes are to be diverted there is concern that cyclists will have to mix with increased levels of road traffic related to the construction programme. The Greenway is also reported to be well-used as a local amenity by walkers and residents.

Potential traffic disruption in the vicinity of Stoneleigh Park with its business parks is also a key concern for the users, as well as potential negative impacts on economic activity within this CFA.

Noise is the second ranked issue in this CFA. This includes both construction activities and the operation of the route, with concern over the noise of high speed trains. Many respondents question the noise assessment methodologies used in the ES and the effectiveness of the mitigation proposed. The village of Burton Green in particular is concerned about the impacts of the line on the community, including village severance leading to questions about the village primary school and access to community amenities. Responses relating to Burton Green included requests for a more extensive tunnel.

The route crosses a number of rivers in this area and many respondents are concerned about the potential impact on surface water drainage and possible increase of flood risk as a consequence of the route infrastructure. Land take and access for farms to cross their holdings is another common theme. The ‘Crackley Gap’ is an area of community amenity in which respondents are concerned about the route impacts. Wildlife corridors and woodland features between Kenilworth and Coventry are prized by many respondents and they are concerned with the extent of potential loss and ecological fragmentation.

The ES consultation process is criticised by many respondents for being too short, and being held over the Christmas period, with difficult access to documents. Many question the baseline assumptions used in the ES and the detail that has been used to influence design choices. Respondents are disappointed with the communication and feedback process used to prepare the ES.
2.2.19  CFA 19 – Coleshill Junction
ES NTS REF: Section 8.19, Page 122
There were 44 comments relating to this CFA

Figure 2-38: CFA19 - Response Type

Figure 2-39: CFA19 - Environmental Issues
The highest ranked issue for respondents in this CFA is traffic, both construction traffic and cumulative impacts from traffic across the area. Noise, disruption and environmental impacts from the proposed construction traffic movements are of concern from respondents in all the communities in this CFA who have responded, though particularly in the Hamlet of Gilson.

Respondents state that as the route will be substantially in high viaducts in their area, the landscape and visual impacts will be great without much possibility of effective mitigation. Despite being located in an area bisected by motorways, respondents are still concerned about noise issues – the second ranked issue, from the construction and operational phases of the project. Community disturbance and disruption during construction is a key concern. Water Orton is also concerned about the proximity of the line to Water Orton School and all respondents are concerned with cumulative impacts across their area.
2.2.20  CFA 20 – Curdworth to Middleton
ES NTS REF: Section 8.20, Page 126
There were 59 comments relating to this CFA

Figure 2-40: CFA20 - Response Type

Figure 2-41: CFA20 - Environmental Issues
The highest ranked issues in this CFA are concerned with the potential impacts of construction on the current quality of life within the communities. Respondents are concerned about loss of amenity with severance leading to isolation of communities, traffic disruption and cumulative impacts across the transport network. Many respondents feel that the communities will suffer a substantial degree of blight as a consequence. Noise, air quality, landscape and visual impacts are particularly cited.

There is particular concern over the proposals for the Kingsbury Railhead facility, located close to the community of Lea Marston. Concerns include light pollution and the continuous nature of potential impacts arising from the proposed 24 hour operation of this facility.

Many respondents comment that the communication process has not enabled them to safeguard their communities effectively.

Respondents from the Middleton area cite the proposed construction facilities and the Langley Brook viaduct as key concerns for their community. Many respondents point out that the ongoing landscape and wildlife initiatives undertaken by the Tam Valley Wetland Landscape Partnership will be threatened by the route construction and are concerned about the general impacts on wildlife, woodlands and amenity.
2.2.21 CFA 21 – Drayton Bassett, Hints and Weeford

ES NTS REF: Section 8.21, Page 130

There were 237 comments relating to this CFA

Figure 2-42: CFA21 - Response Type

Figure 2-43: CFA21 - Environmental Issues
Responses received from this CFA are dominated by the receipt of two campaigns, one a letter, one a postcard, both focussed on a similar outcome. This is to demand that a tunnel is constructed in the vicinity of Hints community which respondents claim will substantially mitigate the visual and noise impacts on Hints village and the surrounding area. The impacts on woodlands are noted along with landscape and amenity loss. The letter campaign states that the work carried out in the ES is superficial and unrealistic and that the proposed mitigation is not satisfactory. This campaign requires the project to implement the mitigation proposed by Staffordshire County Council and also states that the consultation process has been unsatisfactory. The campaign also requires that property blighted by the route construction and operation should be satisfactorily compensated.

Other responses included concerns over community amenity, the impact of construction and traffic on disruption and the resulting impacts as well as the quality of the baseline data for all issues used to underpin the ES.
2.2.22  CFA 22 – Whittington to Handsacre
ES NTS REF: Section 8.22, Page 133
There were 1,002 comments relating to this CFA

Figure 2-44: CFA22 - Response Type

Figure 2-45: CFA22 - Environmental Issues
A majority of responses in this CFA were a campaign which objected to the principles of the HS2 project and the ES as submitted. These general issues are considered in Section 2.1 of this Report. The campaign also states that the HS2 route should be lowered between the West Coast Main Line and the A38 near Lichfield and that people who have been impacted by the line must be properly compensated.

Other responses received also incorporated these two issues but added other concerns, making noise impacts, mainly from line operation, the third ranked issue in this CFA and Other the fourth ranked, with a variety of issues around the HS2 concept being raised. Many respondents commented that the trains would not stop in Lichfield and that the existing West Coast Main Line infrastructure in this CFA and services should be sufficient with upgrading.

Concern was also expressed about the impacts of the route on the land take, woodland and ecology in the area, and that the magnitude of change on the landscape character would be high. Dissatisfaction with the consultation process to date was a common issue from respondents. Many respondents agreed in principle with the ES consultation responses produced by Staffordshire and Lichfield Councils.
2.2.23 CFA 23 – Balsall Common and Hampton-in-Arden
ES NTS REF: Section 8.23, Page 137

There were 190 comments relating to this CFA

Figure 2-46: CFA23 - Response Type

Figure 2-47: CFA23 - Environmental Issues
The high ranking issues in this CFA are influenced by a campaign calling for a tunnel in the area of Balsall Common. These concerns are also shared by many other respondents who are concerned that there is not enough mitigation of operational noise along the route and that the Kenilworth Greenway will be significantly impacted.

Landscape and visual impact is cited as a key issue along the route along with construction impacts from traffic and the disruption to community amenity and quality of life. The impact of the route infrastructure on the surface water which flows into the River Blythe is also mentioned by some respondents. Concerns over the consultation process are the highest ranked issue outside the campaign issues, focussed on communication issues throughout the project development to date.
2.2.24 CFA 24 – Birmingham Interchange and Chelmsley Wood
ES NTS REF: Section 8.24, Page 140
There were 47 comments relating to this CFA

Figure 2-48: CFA24 - Response Type

Figure 2-49: CFA24 - Environmental Issues
The majority of responses in this CFA are from businesses and commercial operations, each of which has specific concerns relating to the potential impacts on their existing operations and planned investments. The disruption likely from construction traffic, alterations to existing road networks and congestion effects on economic activity is a key concern in this CFA. This extends to increases in noise and vibration and general inconvenience that may affect revenue sources. Land take impacts on both economic activity and the wildlife and amenity of the land are also a key concern.

Respondents are particularly concerned that communication with HS2 has not been responsive and although many support the overall economic potential of HS2, they remain apprehensive at the way the Environmental Impact Assessment process has been undertaken. Respondents are concerned at a lack of detail in the ES combined with a perceived disregard for other operations and their business.

Respondents state that the strategic implications of future planning for the area could be significantly impacted by the development of the HS2 route infrastructure and they are concerned that this has not been factored in to the proposed HS2 planning. Concerns include the route itself, the land take for construction facilities and the Birmingham Interchange station, the proposed People Mover system and long-term disruption.
2.2.25 CFA 25 – Castle Bromwich and Bromford

ES NTS REF: Section 8.25, Page 145

There were 35 comments relating to this CFA

Figure 2-50: CFA25 - Response Type

Figure 2-51: CFA25 - Environmental Issues
The majority of responses in this mainly urban and industrial area are from commercial and industrial businesses which are concerned about the likely impacts of the route and disruption of construction activities on their existing operations and property. Land take and compulsory purchase of land and property are of a particular concern. Respondents cite a lack of detail in the ES on likely impacts and proposals for their holdings as a key concern, and many cite a lack of substantive responses from HS2 to previously highlighted issues.

The proposed tunnel in this CFA is a source of concern for affected respondents with the noise, vibration and dust from tunnelling works of concern for sensitive industrial processes. There is also concern at potential impacts on the groundwater. Economic impact on land and assets including proposed development revenue is also a key issue.
2.2.26 CFA 26 – Washwood Heath to Curzon Street

ES NTS REF: Section 8.26, Page 148

There were 64 comments relating to this CFA

Figure 2-52: CFA26 - Response Type

Figure 2-53: CFA26 - Environmental Issues
The highest ranked issue in this CFA is the Socio-economic category, which reflects the responses from business and commercial organisations which are concerned about possible disruption, access, construction impacts and proposed land take on their businesses. For some, the proposals will mean relocation or closure and these respondents are concerned that compensation and discussions will not be forthcoming. Respondents are concerned with the lack of detail in the ES for individual premises and issues of actual land take, land use and mitigation proposals.

Impacts on the existing urban fabric other than commercial premises are also of concern for a selection of respondents. Particular issues for this category include disruption from construction activity, including nuisance, connectivity and destruction of heritage buildings. There is also concern over the potential loss of park space including the newly created Eastside City Park and Park Street Gardens in this predominantly urban area.
2.2.27 Chilterns

There were 8,081 comments relating to the Chilterns Area

Figure 2-54: Chilterns - Response Type

Figure 2-55: Chilterns - Environmental Issues
This geographical area covers the Chilterns as a whole and is responsible for the largest volume of responses received in the ES public consultation exercise. Responses in this category are concerned with the AONB area of the Chilterns without providing any indication or content which ties the response to any of the Chiltern CFAs. Likewise, those responses which do refer to issues in a particular or multiple CFAs are logged in their relevant CFA.

The majority of responses in this category are related to campaigns for an extended tunnel underneath the entire Chilterns AONB area. The ancillary issues on the graph reflect additional issues added to submissions by individuals to supplement the largely standard text.
2.2.28 ‘Other’ Areas
There were 55 comments relating to this category

Figure 2-56: Other - Response Type

Figure 2-57: Other - Environmental Issues
This category includes responses which refer to issues outside the scope of the Phase 1 HS2 consultation and do not refer to any CFA or route issue itself. Examples of responses include general questions about the upgrade of other routes and Phase 2 of HS2 north of the route covered by this consultation.
2.2.29 Area Not Specified

There were 4,667 comments relating to this category.

Figure 2-58: Area Not Specified - Response Type

Figure 2-59: Area Not Specified - Environmental Issues
This is the second largest category of responses received in this consultation exercise. This category captures responses that submit general comments on the proposed HS2 Phase 1 scheme that are applicable to the entire proposed route, the route’s perceived impacts, and the respondent’s opinion, without any reference to a particular CFA (notwithstanding if the respondent actually lives within one of the CFAs).

The six highest ranked issues mainly reflect a campaign. Responses in this category are concerned by and large with the national ‘balance’ of environmental assets and the perceived impact of the route on this heritage and legacy. Respondents frequently question the claims of the ES and its integrity and are generally sceptical about figures and assurances presented in the ES about any of the impacts from the proposed scheme.

There are a number of specific concerns within each issue and these are reflected in the commentary in Section 2.1 of this report. The issues here are usually presented as general concerns, although the Sustainability category is particularly focused on the claims of carbon balance calculations connected with the project and its cumulative effects.
2.2.30 London

There were 52 comments relating to this category

![Pie chart showing response types in London](image)

**Figure 2-60: London - Response Type**

![Bar chart showing environmental issues in London](image)

**Figure 2-61: London - Environmental Issues**
Respondents in this category were concerned about the cumulative impacts the project may have in London, in particular for the potential disruption from construction traffic and impacts on traffic and congestion. Noise and vibration were a key concern and many respondents made general comments about the perceived cost of the scheme.
2.2.31 Off Route Rail Stations

There were 18 comments relating to this category

Figure 2-62: Off Route Rail Stations - Response Type

Figure 2-63: Off Route Rail Stations - Environmental Issues
This category concerns the likely significant environmental effects of Phase 1 of HS2 expected at locations beyond the route corridor, such as rail stations, rail depots and rail lines. Respondents in this category were concerned about the potential impacts for other rail lines heading north out of London, such as the Chiltern Line, West Coast Main Line and Midlands Main Line. These impacts included the potential effect on line traffic during the construction period and potential re-allocation of investment away from the existing lines for the purpose of constructing HS2.
2.2.32 West Coast Main Line
There were 617 comments relating to this category

Figure 2-64: West Coast Main Line - Response Type

Figure 2-65: West Coast Main Line - Environmental Issues
The majority of responses in this area were a campaign which objected to the principles of the HS2 project and the ES as submitted. These general issues are considered in Section 2.1 of this Report. The campaign also states that the HS2 route should be lowered between the West Coast Main Line and the A38 near Lichfield and that people impacted by the line must be properly compensated.

Other responses received also incorporated these two issues but added other concerns, making noise impacts, mainly from line operation, the third ranked issue in this area and Other the fourth ranked, with a variety of issues around the HS2 concept being raised. Many respondents commented that the trains would not stop in Lichfield and that the existing West Coast Main Line infrastructure in this area and services should be sufficient with upgrading.
2.2.33 Birmingham
There were 31 comments relating to this category

Figure 2-66: Birmingham - Response Type

Figure 2-67: Birmingham - Environmental Issues
Responses in this category refer to ‘Birmingham’ without specifying a particular Birmingham-related CFA. Respondents are concerned about the proposed HS2 infrastructure in the area, the purpose of HS2 and the potential impacts it may have through construction disruption across the area, in particular on the existing transport networks and services. This includes rail, road and public transport services.
APPENDIX A
Examples of Campaign Postcards
Important Information

The Government is now asking for the public’s views on their Environmental Statement (ES) which sets out the possible impacts of High Speed Two (HS2) on communities & the environment. The ES is part of the Hybrid Bill process which will now be considered by the Houses of Parliament.

This is your opportunity to inform Parliament about how HS2 will affect
- YOUR quality of life
- YOUR environment and
- YOUR community.

Please make the most of this opportunity to ask Parliament to make changes to the scheme to give Ickenham, Ruislip and Harlesden residents the best possible protection. It is important you raise concerns now so you can seek further mitigation if the scheme progresses.

Please fill in the reverse with your details (or it won’t count) and post it.
NO STAMP IS NEEDED.

Please remember to post your postcard by the January 22nd 2014 (to arrive by the Government’s January 24th deadlines)

Alternatively you can also respond by emailing your comments to:
HS2PhaseOneBillES@dialoguesbydesign.com

Or you can also obtain a longer response form from the government on line by visiting:

Anyone affected can and should respond, not just one per household but each affected resident. If you want more postcards to distribute to friends and family (because anyone affected can respond), or if you have any queries, or need some advice, please contact us at:
info@hillingdon-against-hs2.com.

FREEPOST RTEC-AJUT-GGHH
HS2 Phase One Bill
Environmental Statement
PO Box 70178
London
WC1A 9HS

13 Jan 2016
DEAR PRIME MINISTER AND SECRETARY OF STATE FOR TRANSPORT, THIS IS MY INITIAL RESPONSE TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT CONSULTATION IN PARTICULAR REGARDING CFA 6 & 7. I am deeply concerned by the rejection by the Secretary of State for Transport & HS2 Limited of an extended railway tunnel for the Ickenham & Harfield areas of west London for reasons not properly explained (so presumed to be for entirely monetary reasons). The consequences of this extremely poor environmental decision in favour of a surface rail route in this area are apparent in your Environmental Statement. Some consequences already apparent include:

- **"MAJOR ADVERSE EFFECT ON THE AMENITY OF RESIDENTS, WHICH IS SIGNIFICANT"** and absolutely no benefits or gain from HS2 to any affected local community.
- **"MAJOR ADVERSE"** effects including visual, noise and destruction caused by the construction and use of a 3.4km concrete viaduct in Harfield.
- **"MAJOR ADVERSE"** effects from increased traffic on many important residential roads & commuter routes in Ickenham, Ruislip & Harfield. The monetary value of increased congestion & loss of time does not appear to have been evaluated.
- **"SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE"** effects of Nitrous Oxide (NO2) on important residential roads & school travel routes. You must be aware that increased diesel particulates & NO2 emissions are a considerable health hazard for the school children who use these routes, as well as being hazardous to people with asthma. **"TEMPORARY SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS"** of NO2 in other local areas.
- **"SIGNIFICANT"** effects from construction noise for thousands of residents for up to 10 years. As well as continuing noise for those near the route afterwards.
- **"MAJOR ADVERSE"** effects at important community facilities such as footpaths, Bieneheim Care Centre for the elderly, Ruislip & Haste Hill golf clubs, Ruislip Rifle Club and the Hillingdon Outdoor Activity Centre (used by thousands of children annually, including many disadvantaged children).
- I am concerned about your plans for sustainable placement of materials – 3m high in local fields i.e. the permanent dumping of waste across green belt fields in Ickenham and Harfield with the associated noise and pollution issues plus despoling and forever changing our landscapes.
- I am also concerned about the treatment of contaminated soils and storage of contaminated material in a site between Harvil Road and Breakspear Road South.
- I have concerns about impacts on properties from tunnelling and vibration both during construction and operation.
- No reassurances have been given over hours of operation / traffic and the suggestions have been that hours are flexible as and when you or your agents see fit.
- No information has been provided about the impact & length of utilities work which will exacerbate many of the construction issues and impact a wide range of roads in the area.
- The full range of local impacts likely to affect me, my environment & quality of life is not yet apparent because of the unfairly & inappropriately short length of time you have given (and over the Christmas period) to read an extraordinary number of documents amounting to over 50,000 pages. I demand the right for redress of all further concerns as they gradually become apparent after this unfairly short consultation period, the legal minimum allowed. This situation is worsened by the failure of HS2 or the DFT to hold a consultation event where maps and staff were available for advice / questions.
- But even so it's apparent that despite the huge quantity of documents, the quality of local detail is shockingly poor and unfit for the purpose of making any important decisions which will affect the environment & quality of life in Ickenham, Ruislip & Harfield for years to come. For example the traffic analysis published by HS2 Ltd is based on old data & unsuitable data - it even ignores more recent & more suitable data gathered in 2012 by Robert West on behalf of the London Borough of Hillingdon, which showed peak traffic volumes on Ickenham High Road to be nearer 1,900 vehicles, against the 1,076 in the HS2 report - so there's over 70% more existing traffic than has been acknowledged by HS2 Ltd.
- **THESE LOCAL IMPACTS, & MANY MORE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS NOT YET UNCOVERED FROM THE HUGE AMOUNT OF DOCUMENTS, CAN BE AVOIDED BY EXTENDING THE NORTHOLT TUNNEL FURTHER WESTWARDS. SUCH AN ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSIBLE DECISION COULD MAKE USE OF SCALE ECONOMIES SINCE TUNNEL EQUIPMENT WOULD ALREADY BE IN PLACE, AND WOULD THEREFORE LIKELY PROVE TO BE COST EFFECTIVE AS WELL.**

My other/main concerns

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]

Date: 11/1/14
To Rt Hon Patrick McLoughlin MP

Secretary of State for Transport

Dear Sir,

Response to Phase 1 Environmental Statement Consultation

Your Department recently published an Environmental Statement (ES), which set out the impact of Phase 1 of HS2 on the environment and is currently asking people for their views on this document.

The ES makes clear that there will be numerous highly adverse environmental consequences arising from HS2. These impacts include disruption to drinking water supplies, loss of irreplaceable wildlife species and habitats and deafening noise for thousands.

I believe these impacts are unacceptable.

Even worse, HS2 won’t even succeed in reducing the UK’s carbon emissions. Your own business plan for HS2 forecasts just 1% of passengers will transfer from air and 4% from cars. Most trips on HS2 will either be transferring from existing rail (which emits less carbon) or wholly new trips.

That cannot be right.

The plans set out in the Environmental Statement indicate a consistent failure across the route of Phase 1 to live up to Government promises to deliver proper mitigation.

Effective mitigation must be a priority if HS2 proceeds.

You’ve asked the people to give their say on the environmental impact of HS2 - my view is that for the reasons identified above HS2 is not an environmentally sustainable project.

This is my submission to the consultation.

Yours faithfully,
Question 1: Non technical Summary
7.3 - Air Quality - disregards local traffic increase forecast of 2000 additional vehicle movements every day, as well as impact from Dust from the works for 6 years with Southam being in the prevailing wind direction.

Question 3: Community Forum Area reports. CFA16 Ladbrooke & Southam
- No impact of Light pollution on a site assessed at “Dark skies” by CPRE & Astro Soc

5.4.12-24 - the phrase "minor adverse effect" & "isolation effect on residents is assessed as negligible". No assessment has been carried out of the effect on the community & Business of Southam and the surrounding Villages of both the additional vehicle traffic, 2000 extra lorries every day, the majority 40Ton, and 4 roads, exits from Southam to South and West, (A423, B4451, A425 & Welsh Road West), as well as the Road closure of the Long Itchington Road & the re-alignment of the Fosse Way at the Junction of the Welsh Road West - For up to 6 years - Southam itself could become marooned, and business massively impacted, with a consequent on impact on individuals & the community.

7.4.3-9 Bascofe Heath (Long Itchington) Woods - This is an SSSI, and no impact assessment has been carried out on the effects of tunnelling and construction on the woods.

Flood risk assessment from the works does not appear to have been fully carried out.
FREEPOST RTEC-AJUT-GGHH

HS2 Phase One Bill Environmental Statement
PO Box 70178
London

WC1A 9HS
Regarding the HS2 Phase One Bill Environmental Statement. (Please tick all boxes applying to you.) *(Delete as applicable)*

Construction works for Euston and the Link across Camden to HS1 would cause massive disruption (and delay to road traffic) in Camden for a long time. There is no description of how delay might be avoided or of how inconvenience and/or loss of trade to residents and businesses will be compensated.

My home* / business* would be demolished. There is no explanation of how or when I will be rehoused in the Camden community and kept financially whole.

My home* / business* environment would be badly harmed by the proposed construction works. There is no indication of how the harm could be avoided or of how the harm could be comprehensively measured and compensated for.

There is insufficient detail in the HS2 Phase One Bill Environmental Statement for Camden for me to have any degree of confidence that HS2 Limited is taking all reasonable measures to minimise harm to my living or working environment.

HS2 Limited has failed to demonstrate why its prime London station should be at Euston rather than at Old Oak Common.

There is no demonstrable business case for the tunnelled and surface link to HS1 that would justify either the construction cost or the environmental and economic damage to Camden.

HS2 Limited has totally failed to openly and honestly evaluate suggested alternatives to its "own" proposals such as the Double Deck Down scheme and a fully tunnelled link to HS1. It can thus not justify the environmental consequences of its proposals.

Other comments (please describe), ..............................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................

Please either Freepost this card or you might prefer to email your comments to HS2PhaseOneBill@EustonCamden.com
This is my response to the principle of HS2 and the environmental Statement

- I am opposed to the principle of HS2.
- If it proceeds, all blighted home owners must be properly compensated.
- A short cut and cover tunnel is the only means of providing minimum mitigation against the major adverse visual and noise impact on Hints village, the surrounding areas and its protected landscape including the Ancient Woodlands.

Name: .................................................................
Address: ..............................................................

Post Code: ............................................................

Please post this card by Monday 20th January 2014
Closing Date for Submissions: Friday 24th January
This is my response to the principle of HS2 and the Environmental Statement.
• I am opposed to the principle of HS2
• If it must go ahead there must be effective mitigation which must include lowering the line beneath the WCML and A38 near Lichfield (CFA 22)
• If it must go ahead affected people must be properly compensated

Further comments: ........................................................................................................................................................................
.........................................................................................................................................................................................
.........................................................................................................................................................................................

Name: ...................................................................................................................................................................................
Address: ...................................................................................................................................................................................
Postcode: ..................................................................................................................................................................................

YOU MUST INCLUDE YOUR NAME, ADDRESS & POSTCODE FOR THIS TO BE VALID.

PLEASE POST THIS CARD BY MONDAY 20TH JANUARY 2014
CLOSING DATE FOR SUBMISSIONS: FRIDAY 24TH JANUARY

STOP HS2

www.stophs2.org

www.hs2actionalliance.org
Please deliver to:
FREEPOST RTEC-AJUT-GGHH
HS2 Phase One Bill Environmental Statement
PO Box 70178
London
WC1A 9HS
Consultation response to HS2 Phase 1 environmental statement, Community Forum Area 2 (CFA2)
See what’s proposed at http://tinyurl.com/HS2CamTnEnvSt

Since I would be materially affected by the proposed HS1/HS2 Link line above the ground through Camden Town and the intolerable disruption it would cause for years of construction, I submit this as my response:

"IF an HS1/HS2 Link line is built across Camden Town, it should be tunnelled."

Name: [Redacted]
Address: [Redacted]
Postcode: [Redacted]
Signature: [Redacted]

This initiative is promoted by local Liberal Democrat Camden Councillors: Paul Braithwaite, Chris Naylor, Matt Sanders, Jill Fraser, Rahel Bokth and Tom Simon, who support Camden Council’s cross-party opposition to the potential impact of HS2 on Camden.

PLEASE FILL IN THIS CARD, SIGN AND POST TO ARRIVE BY 24 JANUARY, 2014
FREEPOST RTEC-AJUT-GGHH
HS2 Phase One Bill
PO Box 70178
London
WC1A 9HS

14 JAN 2014